



NURSE LECTURERS' EXPERIENCES IN STUDENTS USE OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK, TIME MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATION DURING RESEARCH SUPERVISION

Anagor Chiamaka Rosemary¹, Chinweuba Anthonia Ukamaka²,

Madu Obiageli Theresa³, and Lukpata Felicia Ekwok⁴

¹⁻⁴Department of Nursing Science, Faculty of Health Sciences and Technology, University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus, Nigeria.

Emails:

¹roseanagor@gmail.com, ²anthonia.chinweuba@unn.edu.ng,

³obiageli.madu@unn.edu.ng, ⁴fellylukpata@ymail.com

Cite this article:

Anagor, C. R., Chinweuba, A. U., Madu, O. T., Lukpata, F. E. (2024), Nurse Lecturers' Experiences in Students Use of Corrective Feedback, Time Management and Communication During Research Supervision. African Journal of Health, Nursing and Midwifery 7(4), 232-247. DOI: 10.52589/AJHNM-XSBDB9ZO

Manuscript History

Received: 17 Oct 2024

Accepted: 2 Dec 2024

Published: 13 Dec 2024

Copyright © 2024 The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits anyone to share, use, reproduce and redistribute in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

ABSTRACT: *Undergraduate and postgraduate students are mandated to write and defend a research project before they will be conferred their honorary degrees with the sole aim of making them become proficient independent researchers. Nurse lecturers like every other lecturer are saddled with the responsibility of scrutinizing students' project write-ups thoroughly, ensuring that a polished version of the work emanates at the end. The study aims to explore nurse lecturers' experiences as regards students' use of corrective feedbacks, time management and their communication gaps. A phenomenological qualitative research method was used for the study. The study was conducted with 19 lecturers from universities in Southeast Nigeria who agreed to participate voluntarily via in-depth interviews after meeting the inclusion criteria. Colaizzi's method of data analysis was employed to extract 4 themes and 10 subthemes. The themes identified are; 'Cordial student-supervisor relationship, Difficulty with keeping to time-schedules, Determined and Undetermined students and Students appreciate feedback but have difficulty in implementation'. From the study, it was concluded that students need to improve on their communication level, make judicious use of their time and implement feedbacks as instructed by their research supervisors. Therefore, the researchers recommend a cordial mentor-mentee relationship between supervisors and supervisees which will lead to a dynamic trusting supervisory relationship so as to ensure a smooth success of the student's project.*

KEYWORDS: Research supervision, corrective feedback, time management, communication, experiences, nurse lecturers.



INTRODUCTION

Research supervision in higher institutions is a task every academic must embrace. It is an integral and unavoidable aspect of tertiary education and therefore demands a great level of commitment from both the supervisor and the supervisee (Ayua, 2022). Undergraduate and postgraduate students are usually assigned to lecturers for research supervision depending on their job rank. The essence of assigning students under the tutelage of supervisors is to guarantee quality research in the long run (Ayua, 2022). Students are required to write a research project and are mandated to defend these projects within a specific time frame before they will be conferred their honorary degrees (Mensah et al., 2023; Bayona-Ore, 2021; Gedamu, 2018). Hence, the sole aim of research supervision is usually gearing up the student to become proficient independent researchers (Gedamu, 2018; Shahzad, 2019; Mothiba, 2019).

Nurse lecturers like every other lecturer are saddled with the responsibility of scrutinising students' projects thoroughly, ensuring that a polished version of the work emanates at the end. They often offer constructive criticism or feedback (Mensah, 2023), which can build students' self-esteem but take precautions so as not to dampen the students' spirits via negative feedback (Mothiba, 2019). In all, for a smooth, timely project writing and research supervision on the part of the student and lecturer respectively, it is paramount that there should be a good mentor-mentee relationship by both parties that is hinged on an effective communication system, good use of limited time and willingness to take corrections on the part of the student. This interaction is crucial and can affect the quality of the student's research project (Bayona-Ore, 2021).

Globally, in most tertiary institutions including Nigeria, the norm has always been for students to identify a problem in their fields worth researching, get the topic approved by their assigned research supervisors and then begin the herculean task of writing. These academic research papers aim to produce a systemic, rigorous, novel, and creative text (Bayona-Ore, 2021). At intervals, drafts of the written works will be submitted to their supervisors who then make remedial inputs for the student's attention, otherwise known as corrective feedback. Students are expected to act on the feedback, make the necessary adjustments and resubmit their work to their supervisors for further evaluation, then the circle continues until the latter seems satisfied with the final output. Yet despite the back and forth from both parties, the onus lies on the supervisee, to ensure that they finish their project at the stipulated time meted out by the institution. Failure to do so will incur a myriad of consequences for the student such as the inability to graduate when due, extra financial obligations alongside social and psychological implications (Mbogo et al., 2022; Ayua, 2022). It is at this stage no doubt where time management skills of effective planning, prioritizing and realistic goal setting come in handy in order to attain the highest levels of academic achievement. Further, students who wish to surmount the challenge of writing a good research project must be willing to maintain an open communication system with their supervisors where issues concerning the research project can be discussed. Then depending on issues raised, it is the responsibility of the student to make the necessary adjustments and to do so within a reasonable amount of time.

Presently, it seems that lecturers have been largely blamed for students' poor research output and high attrition rates as regards research projects. Students have been noted to abandon their academic program or withdraw from the program due to the study expiration period after successfully finishing their coursework because of the frustrating research writing, especially in terms of delayed feedback and poor communication from supervisors (Mensah, 2023;



Mbogo 2022; Ayua, 2022). Moreover, when supervisors give feedback, they are usually unclear and conflicting thereby wrecking the student's effort and pushing them back and forth to issues that should have been handled beforehand (Mbogo, 2022). In their defence, supervisors in some other studies have cried out that students do not keep in touch with them after completing their coursework, and when they do, they lack expressive English skills, their works are poorly referenced, and the sources are obsolete (Mbogo, 2022). Other local studies have accused lecturers of having too many students than they can cope with and being too busy with administrative, teaching or personal issues that they have little or no time for them (Mothiba, 2019).

Tons of literature has called for lecturers to provide constructive and timely feedback to forestall any delays (Ayua, 2022; Bayona-ore, 2021; Gedamu, 2018; Shahzad, 2019; Mothiba, 2019), encourage a seamless communication system whereby no restrictions are placed on students' comments and opinions (Bayona-ore 2021; Gedamu 2018), track students' progress, conduct regular meetings (Shahzad, 2019; Bayona-ore, 2021; Chikte & Chabilall, 2016; Ayua, 2022; Gedamu 2018) and support supervisee manage his/her time effectively for in-time completion of research project (Shahzad, 2019). Some other studies blame the quality of the supervisor's supervision as most research projects by students were below the required quality standards despite the professional support rendered (Gedamu, 2018). Nevertheless, to the knowledge of the researchers, studies have mostly centred on students' experiences during research project writing without regarding the perspectives of the research supervisors. Therefore, students' use of corrective feedback from their lecturers, the judicious use of their limited time and their communicative abilities are gaps left uncovered that this study hopes to bridge by expounding on nurse lecturers' experiences in this regard.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative research design, using the descriptive phenomenological approach. This design gave room for nurse academics to give detailed information about their personal experiences as regards 'communication, time management and use of corrective feedback' during the supervision of nursing students' research projects.

Study Population

The study population was made up of nurse academics tutoring at Universities in South East Nigeria, in the Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Nursing. They were carefully handpicked based on the judgement of the researchers while cutting across a variety of academic ranks, work experiences and speciality degrees to ensure that these information-rich cases will be beneficial to the phenomenon of interest.

Sample Size

A sample size of 19 participants who met the inclusion criteria were interviewed after data saturation had been achieved and no new themes or information was further observed.



Sampling Technique

A purposive sampling technique was used to select 19 participants for the study who were subjected to in-depth interviews.

Inclusion Criteria

- Being a nurse academic in the department of nursing for at least 3 years
- Willingness to participate in the study
- Have previously supervised students' research work in the last 2 years
- Currently supervising nursing students' research work

Exclusion Criteria

- Universities in South East Nigeria that do not offer Bachelor of Nursing (B.NSc) degree within 5 years of candidature for UTME students and 4 years for direct entry students
- Nurse academics who have not previously supervised students' projects
- Nurse academics who were not supervising students' projects at the time of the study.

Instrument for Data Collection

A semi-structured interview guide was used to gather qualitative data. The interview guide was divided into sections, questions and follow-up questions/probes that were guided by the study's research questions.

Procedure for Data Collection

Data was collected through face-to-face interviews with each participant at chosen venues free from disturbances, commotions and intrusions, after obtaining permission from the participants. Before the interview, a questionnaire was used to obtain information on the demographic characteristics of the participants (table 1). The interview lasted approximately 40-60 minutes, with a mean duration of 50 minutes. All interactions were in English language and were recorded on an audio tape recorder.

Data Analysis

Colaizzi's method of qualitative content analysis was employed in analysing the data and it began as soon as the first interview was completed. This was done by listening to the audio tape recordings and transcribing it verbatim, then each transcript was read and re-read, to look for similarities and differences that enabled the researchers to develop themes and categories. It is a rigorous analysis with a distinctive seven-step process which provides significant statements and codes that are attuned to the research questions under study with each step staying close to the data and validated by the participants that created it.



Ethical Consideration

Ethical approval was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Nigeria Teaching Hospital, Ituku Ozalla (Ref no: UNTH/CSA/329/VOL.5). The aims of the study and its voluntary nature were explained to willing participants who gave a verbal informed consent. Their anonymity and confidentiality were maintained by using 'participant 1, 2, 3 etc. and not their real names.

RESULTS

This qualitative data recruited 19 participants with different age variations, marital status and years of working experience as shown in Table 1. Four (4) major themes and ten (10) sub-themes were abstracted from the participants' experiences as shown in Table 2.

Table 1: Showing demographic variables of study participant $n = 19$

Variables		N	%
Age in Years	20 -30	2	10.5
	31-40	5	26.3
	41- 50	2	10.5
	51- 60	7	36.9
	≥ 61	3	15.8
Gender	Male	5	26.3
	Female	14	73.7
Marital Status	Married	16	84.2
	Single	2	10.5
	Widowed	1	5.3
Years of Working Experience	1 - 10	11	57.9
	11 - 20	4	21.0
	21 - 30	3	15.8
	≥ 31	1	5.3
Occupational Status	Lecturer 1	9	47.4
	Lecturer 11	3	15.8
	Senior lecturer	4	21.0
	Professor	3	15.8

**Table 2: Thematic summary of the responses**

SN	Theme	Sub-theme
1	Cordial student-supervisor relationship	Encourage frequent communication
		Utilize varied media of communication.
		Students are pace-setters
2	Difficulty with keeping to time-schedules	Students lack consciousness of time
		An ideal time frame is allotted for research activities
3	Determined and Undetermined students	Students are resilient
		Provide solutions for undetermined students
4	Students appreciate feedback but have difficulty in the implementation	Students who understand integrated corrections
		Deficient knowledge of research methodology makes students shy away.
		Supervisors employ various measures to ensure integration.

Theme 1: Cordial Student-Supervisor Relationship: This theme emerged with three sub-themes namely; Encourage frequent communication, utilize varied media of communication and students are pace-setters. The sub-themes illuminate participants' experiences in communication modes utilized to enhance the completion of the supervisees' research project.

Sub-Theme 1: Encourage Frequent Communication: Participants ascertained that a cordial relationship exists which enhances effective communication for supervision and completion of the research project. It was however pertinent to note that sometimes, supervisors were the initiators.

A very cordial approach is needed for success, but not at the beginning, because usually, they shy away, I collect their numbers and keep on calling to follow them up. Some of them give excuses for being sick just to shy away but when they see my consistency in chatting them up and calling them, they have no choice but to follow up and then a cordial relationship develops over time (participant 19)

My typical supervision, what it looks like.... let me use the term cordial. It is a cordial one, I try to make them understand that in as much as I am their teacher and supervisor, I don't bite, you can actually ask me questions and approach me when you need clarification. I found out that when I do this, they become open to me and they share their experiences with me, especially during the fieldwork or collection of data (participant 7)

I found out that some students already have an inbuilt phobia for their lecturers because sometimes they feel like my project may not be up to date or up to standard, you know...and that makes them afraid. This causes barriers in communication. Many times, I have to make



them relax and adjust so that I can be able to do effective supervision. So, I initiate or allow a cordial relationship to develop and remind them that I am their guide on this research project path (participant 17)

Sub-theme 2: Utilize varied Media of Communication: This subtheme illuminates' the medium of communication between supervisors and supervisees with respect to the research project. Study participants narrated experiences with the use of phone calls, text messages, face to face and social medium platforms.

Although face-to-face is more comprehensive, the medium I use frequently is phone calls. Actually phone calls because sometimes, particularly those who come from far places, I consider the distance and the risk and prefer to call so that we discuss. It's either I call or the person calls me, then we discuss on the phone... (participant 1)

Telephone, WhatsApp. I call on the telephone first and ask the student to log onto WhatsApp so that we can switch over to WhatsApp call so that I can talk at length. You know that they are students and are not working, so using their airtime will cost them much more. Sometimes I tell them when I would call, I can tell them 'I will be with you say 8 pm, sit down with your computer system, open your work, I have a lot of concerns' (participant 9)

Face-to-face, because it is there and then, you give the supervisee the opportunity to seek clarification on the observation you may have made on their work, I can ask questions and get it clarified. It has an advantage over the phone. Phone will require credit and we don't know who can afford phone calls for several minutes (participant 8).

Most times I use various means. Sometimes we talk on the phone especially when we need to book an appointment or time to discuss their work. Sometimes we meet face to face when we need to sit down and go through the work so it is not a stereotyped way of communication, it varies depending on what information I want to pass at that time. Sometimes I also use the WhatsApp medium (participant 11).

Sub-theme 3: Students are Pace Setters: This sub-theme illuminates' participants' opinions on how often they could interact with their supervisees. It is however obvious that communication pace is dependent on the student, some students delay before submitting their works but are often eager to collect edited copies within two or more days. Other participants affirm setting deadlines to encourage faster turnovers.

It depends on the student. Some make it easy for me, some make it very difficult, and some students will submit their work and may not even follow it up. There are others that will submit it around weekends, during..., when there is an oncoming holiday or something, that's like a take-home assignment for me, when they know that I am not going to be around, they just drop it for me (participant 1)

Students are always eager to get their work done, although they delay submission, for a good number of such students after submitting, even though they have taken two to five months to submit the work, in the next two, or three days, they will start asking you whether the work is ready (participant 4).

The students are often not serious until the time is running out, and then they start hurrying and mounting pressure. From inception, I tell them my pace and tell them to submit their work.



I usually send a text message when I have finished, I also tell them when to deposit the next chapter (participant 18).

This aspect right now is one of the challenges I face in my area of supervision. When I have supervisees who are unwilling to cooperate, I try to give them deadlines to finish data collection, fieldwork or finish a chapter. I found out that when I give them deadlines it motivates them to work but when I don't give them deadlines then those who are not very communicative relax (participant 7).

Theme 2: Difficulty with Keeping to Time Schedules: This theme emerged with two sub-themes namely: 'Students lack consciousness of time and Ideal time frame is allotted for research activities.

Sub-theme 1: Students lack Consciousness of time: This subtheme illuminates' students' working pace concerning research. It was obvious that students determine their working pace and do not comply with the schedule, some demonstrate a laissez-faire attitude, waiting until the deadline is announced, and some prefer last-minute rush and do this on purpose to prevent thorough scrutiny of their work.

The student time management as I said earlier, about 80% of students are slow and do not manage their time very well..., some of them from the moment they are assigned supervisors, you may not see them. Some may just come and disappear, towards the end of the program, when the date of project defence is drawing closer, they will come out and start calling you (participant 13)

It's terrible! You know after the initial gra gra (pretend seriousness)", where everybody wants to come; 'Ma, when can we see you, this and that, it is usually okay, then I say bring your topics and come'. At the initial time, everybody wants to show that the zeal is there. Immediately after the topic is approved you see this period of relaxation where I will be asking them, 'Where is your work now.' They'll say, 'ma, I'm working on it, ma, I'm working on it' (participant 3)

Until when it is announced 'you have four weeks to submit your work', they will now drop their written work in the morning, they'll call you in the evening, 'ma, I put my project in your pigeon hole and it is still there'. I'll say, 'You can take it now if you don't want it to be there'. So typically, that's what it looks like. Everybody relaxes until injury time (participant 5).

Yes, there are some of them even when I make corrections, they won't come for it, and they will keep their work. Even when I send for them, I may not even see them but once deadlines have been announced, that is when they start panicking, they will stress me, they will push me and all that. And at those times I am not really happy to supervise them because they will be disturbing me and I may have so many other things I am doing at that period. These are some of the challenges (participant 2)

Some of them need to be pulled along, if you don't ask for them, they will just disappear only to surface at zero hour and rush and they want you to perform magic to quickly look at the work. Some of them do this strategically so that you won't have time to scrutinize the work (participant 8)



Sub-theme 2: Ideal Time Frame is Allotted for Research Activities: This sub-theme seeks to ascertain the estimated duration a student is supposed to finish an entire research project. While assessing the time frame allotted for research activities, participants disclosed that it should span between three to six months while some others said that allotted time should be according to the type of research.

Six months should be enough for undergraduate research, but they often do not utilize that time frame... (participant 19).

Well for undergraduate work, if not for the other commitments they have with their studies. I think three months is okay, that's my own. I think if you are serious because the truth is that, even if it is one month to that project defence, some will still be ready, they will still finish it, you understand, and they now finish it in a haphazard way. So, I think, okay let me not say, let me not be too stingy with time, but if they give themselves five months, but if you're serious, and you have three months, you can still accomplish it. So, between three to five months for undergraduate work (participant 6).

It depends on the kind of study. If it is a student who is carrying out a cause-and-effect study, I don't expect him/her to finish at the same time as a student who is doing a retrospective study. A student who is doing a retrospective study is going out to collect data from archives that have already been studied but for a student who is doing a cause-and-effect study or an experimental study, the person may be doing the study for over a period of time.

Theme 3: Determined and Undetermined Students: This theme emerged with two sub-themes namely: 'Students are resilient and Provide solutions for undetermined students.

Sub-theme 1: Students are Resilient: This sub-theme marked students' determination, persistence and dogged abilities toward completion of their research project

Yes, although the majority are complacent about research work, there are good ones that I have supervised and I will enjoy supervising students because they keep coming and are persistent, they understand my corrections, they will do it, they will keep coming, I will just go and relax, and they will be the ones disturbing me. At the appropriate time, their work will be completed (participant 2).

The determined ones are very few. If I am supervising 15 students, at the end of the day I will have about 3 or 4 students who are enthusiastic. It's just few exceptions and for those few students, I really enjoy supervising (participant 12).

Hmmm, now, the truth is there are some students who work with time, they want to get the work done as soon as possible, you will see it in the way they follow up the work, their early submissions and their attitude.... you know, they call me, sometimes I feel disturbed, they always keep in touch (participant 7).

Ah, very few but, I always look forward to such students and it makes my work easier. They respond and such students are quality students, they are the type of students that produce quality work, I like working with them and encouraging them (participant 8).



Sub-theme 2: Provide Solutions for Undetermined Students: This sub-theme reveals measures adopted by study participants to aid students in completing their research projects. Participants disclosed that students may have genuine reasons why they are sluggish with their projects and it would depend on their assessment before they can decide on which corrective measures to adopt which may include helping them or issuing threats.

Sometimes while discussing with them, I try to establish reasons why they are not meeting targets because there may be peculiar, honest situations that may be affecting the student and it is only through discussion that I get to know them. If eventually, the student comes up to explain that there were some issues, for example, one who may be pregnant and the pregnancy is disturbing or put to bed and the baby care is a challenge or travelled. And anything that is a cogent reason, that one is understandable. Then I will find a way to help such students (participant 1).

I notice they are very weak; I am the one even pushing them. Sometimes, I am even the one providing their materials. You know, all fingers are not equal, so different individuals, some have family issues, financial issues and some psychological problems and they all should be treated differently (participant 4).

So, I push them hard and tell them 'If you tend to delay, I am going to the HOD to inform the HOD I don't want to supervise you'. If anyone is giving me issues, I go with them to the HOD and tell him that I don't want to supervise that student. I have done that to two students (participant 12).

What I usually do when I identify a student in my group who is doing well, I link the others up, he or she becomes like a sort of a watchdog over others. I usually encourage them to discuss together, to pass their work to themselves, read through it and make corrections and so on, before it comes to me. Such things help. If somebody is missing, it is easier identified by the group (participant 9).

Yes. Like now we say before so so so, but the interval will be large enough to give them room because if I don't give them deadline, then I won't get anything because students work under pressure, but it wouldn't be such a pressure that I won't get quality work, but I must set time. Like now we are preparing for the pre-council exams, we have told students that they must submit chapters one to three plus their questionnaires if they are going to be part of that exam. That is the language. You know it's only exam language that students understand (participant 17).

Theme 4: Students Appreciate Feedback but Have Difficulty in Implementation: This theme emerged with three sub-themes namely: 'Students who understand integrate corrections, Deficient knowledge of research methodology makes students shy away and Supervisors employ various measures to ensure integration'.

Sub-theme 1: Students who Understand Integrate Corrections: Study participants observed that as soon as students are aware of the essence of corrections, they look forward to it, but when students download already completed projects from the internet, they may be hesitant in integrating corrections, but with communication of supervisor's stance they start implementing it.



Okay so, I make them understand that whatever correction I make is for their good. And when I don't correct your work, you should be worried because it means that I didn't look at it. So, from my own experience, once the student understands your intention towards the corrections, you don't have a problem with it. In fact, when they understand it, they will be the ones begging you to correct them (participant 3).

The ability to integrate correction is individual-based. There are students who will follow my correction to the letter. A good number of them will try to effect the corrections, although they may not integrate it completely. But none of them really objects to the correction, they accept it, some even enjoy it, you know, they see it as a means of learning, yeah (participant 15).

You know, sometimes they will feel that they have..., I do not know. Some of them, maybe have downloaded things from the internet. So, when you give them corrections, they will think "Ahh, I don't think this person knows what she is doing, that this one is better." Do you understand? So, some of them will not be affected. But when they come, I tell them, if you do not effect my corrections, you'll start supervising yourself or something. So, some of them do not take corrections, but the majority of them do (participant 4).

Sub-theme 2: Deficient Knowledge of Research Methodology Makes Students Shy Away:

This sub-theme illuminates participants' experiences with the integration of inputs as well as the reason for such hesitancy and poor compliance.

They don't apply those corrections, it's just a few of them and those that don't apply the corrections are not because they don't want to but because they don't have the knowledge, they lack knowledge of research methodology (participant 5).

Students don't want any stress. Most students don't do the corrections, they will type and bring it back to you, so when you assume that they have done the corrections you are missing it. And another one is, when I see that the student is just copying something from the internet, verbatim and dropping it there for me, that's a sign of un-seriousness and no one should be comfortable about that. They are most often the ones who feel there should be no corrections and when corrections come, they do not know what to do (participant 13).

It is annoying, and I feel... sometimes I'm irritated, yeah, especially when..., you know if you give dozens of corrections and if the person does a greater percentage, maybe you omit one or two, it's quite understandable. But when I give them and they just do a few and still return the work, that's when it's annoying. And some of them will tell me that they forgot, or maybe they don't really know what to do. So, it depends on the scenario and that determines my reaction (participant 11).

It is often annoying when somebody submit a work, punctuation is the most painful aspect, where there should be a full stop, and you won't see a full stop, where there should be a space, no space, where there should be coma something like that. It's just an evidence that this student did not take the time to read through that work. He just submitted it like, 'go and suffer' (frowns), so it doesn't give joy, it is annoying (participant 1).

So, they don't really adhere, not all, what I observed is that most times they pick corrections and those that are simple, they will do it. The ones that are difficult and they don't know what to do they will simply leave it for you, you know, until maybe I emphasize and maybe show that I am serious with them, then some of them will now make an attempt. Some of them, when they



do corrections, will not really do what I want while others feel upset that I give so many corrections that I look at every line. So, it depends on the nature of the corrections (participant 6).

Sub-theme 3: Supervisors Employ Various Measures to Ensure Integration: This sub-theme reveals measures utilized by supervisors to ensure that supervisees integrate corrections. These include; creating awareness, one-on-one teaching, peer group mentoring, motivation and handing over old suggestions and integration before accepting new ones.

...Sometimes I have to sit down with them and emphasize what I want..., I even use my hand to give an example, by doing so, some then understand (participant 7).

... Now, we use a peer group, assign them to others who have done theirs so they can brainstorm together., I notice that it really works (participant 11).

There is something I do when I go through scripts, I usually tick a very small good with a red pen on the paper if the student makes a very good statement or expresses themselves very well. It is a sort of encouragement. It makes students check on the good ticked because I can't only be dwelling on only the negatives. I found out that it encourages them. It is always good to acknowledge a well-articulated work so that when I see what is wrong, I shout and it will be like a mixed grill. So, I don't only see evil but also the good (participant 18).

If you are a careless supervisor you may think the student has done the corrections, and lie. And so, what I do is when you want to resubmit your work, you must bring the first copy I corrected. I go straight to what I asked you to do, see the new submission and know if you have done it. It helps students know that I will look at what I have worked on before. It helps me to know that I am not reading a work several times. Many of them when they go to their system, they don't change what I have asked them to change, hoping and praying that I don't notice it (participant 13).

DISCUSSION

The majority of the participants in this study acknowledge that a cordial relationship or approach leading to a dynamic trusting supervisory relationship is needed for the smooth success and excellence of the student's project, a notion that was also shared by lecturers in Severinsson's (2015) research study. Some participants noted that they were even the initiators of the communication between themselves and the students contrary to the popular notion that students are supposed to be the ones disturbing their supervisors. Supervisors in other studies have revealed a lack of communication on the part of the student (Yousefi et al, 2015; Ismail et al, 2011). In this study, students may want immediate feedback on their work but doing it right is much more important and that cannot be achieved if they do not draw closer to their supervisors as disclosed by a participant. In fact, effective communication has been affirmed by another participant as a very good tool which has brought him closer and friendlier with his students but some students have an inbuilt phobia for their lecturers, and tend to avoid their supervisors. This view contradicts Severinsson's (2015) and Odunze's (2019) findings; students were in agreement about the necessity of regular contact to discuss their work and any associated problems with their supervisors, although they have remained unhappy with the supervisory relationship because of the difficulty in communication and lack of personal



chemistry. Study participants confirmed utilizing varied means of communication to interact with their students such as; face-to-face meetings, writing feedback on the student's manuscript, phone calls, text messages and social media platforms (WhatsApp). In this study, participants reveal that some students make interaction easy for their supervisors, while the rest make it very difficult for them. The solution employed by most supervisors to tackle the difficult students is 'setting deadlines'. Setting deadlines for different sections of the project work has helped a great deal, such as deadlines to finish data collection/ fieldwork or to finish a chapter, participants agree that it motivates students to work hard.

Participants' experiences with students' allocated time band revealed that students determine their working pace and do not comply with the schedule. Almost all participants confirmed that the majority of the students are slow and lack time management when it comes to their projects. Students have been accused of fizzling away and displaying a laissez-faire attitude as soon as a topic is approved for them only to resurface again close to examination/ assessment periods. Participants in this study voiced their displeasure over such a last-minute rush because they have other commitments and would not be pleased to embrace such extra stressors. In contrast, student participants in Qasem and Zayid's (2019) study have complained that the time allocated for writing research proposals was always inadequate. Yet, some participants in this study observed that poor time management was done on purpose to prevent proper scrutiny by the lecturers, seeing that there would be a rush at the last minute and nobody would trouble them more. This appalling revelation shows the extent students would go to prevent excessive feedback on their work. Participants affirm that even though students juggle through class work activities, assignments, and tests/exams which may distract the research project, a good student should be able to finish up their project work within 5 to 6 months if they keep interfacing with their supervisors and implementing the corrections which are in congruence with Odunze (2019) research. In order for supervisors to ensure timely completion of students' research projects, they adopt many approaches to aid the students. Participants affirm that sometimes there may be genuine reasons for a general laissez-faire attitude exhibited by students which inform a need to help, such as disturbing pregnancies, a newly nursing mother experiencing baby care challenges, or even sicknesses which require hospitalization, etc. Other challenges range from financial issues, family issues and psychological issues. Some participants noted that they find themselves providing materials for those they consider weak, which is in line with what Mhunpiew (2013) admonished supervisors in the book "A Supervisor's Roles for Successful Thesis and Dissertation" to provide specific technical support to students including relevant works of literature, structuring the thesis/dissertation, broadening intellectual support etc. Other participants have utilized extreme measures such as the use of threats, embarrassment, issuing notes of warning and 'signing of undertaken' to awaken lazy students. This has been reportedly beneficial, as participants disclosed that students love to be pressurized since that is the major language they understand which is in support of Askew et al. (2016) study. Still, some study participants advocated student-to-student mentoring, where bright students are paired with others to encourage discussion and inspire one another to read each other's work and make necessary corrections before it gets to the supervisor. This is commendable as Severinsson (2015) supports this view.

Several authors agree that it is the duty of the supervisor to read through and provide critical, constructive feedback on drafts of the student's work as this happens to be a crucial factor in the student's intellectual development (Afferro & Zainal, 2014; Milne, 2017; Bacwayo et al., 2017). In this study, participants have concurred that the ability to integrate corrections is



individual based but when students download project works from online sources or the internet, and begin to copy these works verbatim, they may be hesitant in integrating corrections because they believe that the downloaded material is an already perfect work and most likely their supervisors do not know what they are doing. It usually takes a firm stance from the supervisors before they start implementing feedback. Other students have been poorly compliant with utilizing input given by their supervisors because they lack knowledge of research methodology. Irritating moments have been experienced by supervisors when students hand over work filled with punctuation errors. Students sometimes think that supervisors may not be aware of their failure to integrate corrections when they hand over newly assumable edited copies to their supervisors, hoping that these lecturers cannot remember what feedback they have previously given whereas other students usually integrate simple suggestions and ignore those perceived as challenging. Participants divulged that students are not entirely happy about corrective feedback being made on their work, because they feel like it is an additional stressor imposed on them. Some feel upset that supervisors give excessive corrections or look at every single detail but various measures have been exploited by supervisors to ensure that supervisees integrate corrections which includes; one one-on-one tutoring, peer grouping, insisting on students handing in previous corrected versions of their work before new submissions will be accepted so that efforts will not be duplicated. In addition, some study participants motivate their students while editing their work; a participant noted applauding good points on the scripts with a small tick of a red pen, especially when the student makes a very good statement or expresses themselves very well. This sort of attitude has been supported by Bacwayo et al (2017), who noted that it is important for supervisors to provide positive and negative feedback to students, students need to be affirmed when their work is good just the same way they expect to be informed on areas their work requires improvement. It serves as a sort of encouragement; students look forward to the number of goods ticked because it is unfair to dwell on only the negatives, acknowledging a well-articulated work is necessary so that when wrongs are discovered and supervisors react, it will be a mixed grill.

CONCLUSION

From these findings, it was concluded that a cordial relationship between supervisor and supervisee is essential for a successful research project. Students need to improve on their communication level, and time management and implement feedback as instructed by their supervisors.



REFERENCES

1. Affero, I. & Zainal, N. (2014). The Supervision's Relationship of Student-Supervisor in a Malaysian Technical and Vocational Education and Training Institution: A Preliminary Study. Conference Paper. DOI: 10.13140/2.1.3208.7845
2. Askew, C., Dixon, R., McCormick, R. & Callaghan, K. (2016). Facilitators and Barriers to Doctoral Supervision: A Case Study in Health Sciences. *Issues in Educational Research* 26 (1), 2016
3. Ayua, G.A., Samuel, K. & Agbidye, A. (2022). Science Education Supervisors' Expectation on Research Project Writing and Attitude to its Supervision in Nigerian Universities. *Journal of Science, Technology, Mathematics and Entrepreneurial Education (JSTMEE)* 2(1):177-187
4. Bacwayo, K. E., Nampala, P. & Oteyo, I. N. (2017). Challenges and Opportunities Associated with Supervising Graduate Students Enrolled in African Universities. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 5(3):29-39. DOI: 10.18488/journal.61/2017.5.3/61.3.29.39
5. Bayona-Ore, S. (2021). Perceptions of Postgraduate Students on the Relationship Between Thesis Development and Performance of a Supervisor. *Journal of Turkish Science Education* 18 (4): 559-573. doi: 10.36681/tused.2021.90.
6. Chikte, U.M.E. & Chabilall, J.A. (2016). Exploration of Supervisor and Student Experiences during Master's Studies in a Health Science Faculty. *South African Journal of Higher Education*. 30(1):25-79. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.20853/30-1-559>
7. Gedamu, A. (2018). TEFL Graduate Supervisees' Views of their Supervisors' Supervisory Styles and Satisfaction with Thesis Supervision". *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research* 6 (1): 63-74.
8. Ismail, A., Abiddin, N.Z., & Hassan, A. (2011). Improving the Development of Postgraduates' Research and Supervision. *International Education Studies*, 4(1):78-89.
9. Mbogo, R.W., Ndiao, E., Wambua, J.M., Ileri, N.W. and Ngala, F.W. (2022). Supervision Challenges and Delays in Completion of PhD Programmes in Public and Private Universities: Experiences of Supervisors and Graduate Students in Kenya. *European Journal of Education Studies* 6(11): 261-274
10. Mensah, P.O, Fatai, A.A, Sunday, A.A, Oluwayemisi, D.A. et al (2023). Exploring the Perceptions and Experiences of University Lecturers on Corrective Feedback in Students' Research Project supervision: A case for Computer-mediated Mode. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education* 15(5): 1253-1275. DOI: 10.1108/JARHE-08-2022-0273
11. Mhunpiew, N. (2013). A Supervisor's Roles for Successful Thesis and Dissertation. *US-China Education Review A*, 3(2):119-122.
12. Milne, D. (2017). An Empirical Definition of Supervision. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* 46(Pt 4):437-47. DOI: 10.1348/014466507X197415. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/6299628_An_empirical_definition_of_supervision
13. Mothiba, T.M., Maputle, M.S. & Goon, D.T. (2019). Understanding the Practices and Experiences of Supervising Nursing Doctoral Students: A Qualitative Survey of Two South African Universities. *Global Journal of Health Science* 11(6): 123-131. doi:10.5539/gjhs.v11n6p123
14. Odunze, D. I. (2019). Examining the Challenges Faced by Undergraduate Students in Writing Research Projects. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.24476.64643



15. Qasem, F.A.A. & Zayid, E.I.M (2019). The Challenges and Problems Faced by Students in the Early Stage of Writing Research Projects in L2, University of Bisha, Saudi Arabia. *European Journal of Special Education Research*, 4(1). doi.10.5281/zenodo.2557036
16. Severinsson, E. (2015). Rights and Responsibilities in Research Supervision. *Nursing and Health Sciences*, 17(2), 195–200. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nhs.12160>.
17. Shahzad, S., Ali, M. & Ayub, U. (2019). Perceptions of Supervisors and Supervisees about Supervisor Role and Responsibilities in Student Research Work. *Global Social Sciences Review (GSSR)*. 4(2): 356 – 364. [http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2019\(IV-II\).46](http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gssr.2019(IV-II).46)
18. Yousefi, A., Bazrafkan, L. & Yamani, N. (2015). A Qualitative Inquiry into the Challenges and Complexities of Research Supervision: Viewpoints of Postgraduate Students and Faculty Members. *Journal of Advances in Medical Education & Professionalism*, 3(3): 91–98